



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MY

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
09/740,064	12/20/2000	Hiroshi Yoshida	KAW-238-USAP	1137
28892	7590	10/19/2004	EXAMINER	
SNIDER & ASSOCIATES			HOTALING, JOHN M	
P. O. BOX 27613			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20038-7613			3713	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/740,064

Applicant(s)

YOSHIDA ET AL.

Examiner

John M Hotaling II

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stockdale et al US Patent 6,251,014 in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary Third Edition page 451 definition for structured programming. Stockdale discloses all of the instant application with the exception of specifically stating the use of a hierarchical processing structure and mid level instructions. Instead Stockdale discloses all of the inputs and outputs of a gaming machine may be controlled by a master gaming controller which sends out high level instructions to a peripheral controller which can use the high level instructions to send low level instruction precisely controlling the operation of its drive mechanism or pass the high level instructions to a second slot reel peripheral. Stockdale provides a method for controlling operation of a slot reel peripheral containing a single slot reel on a gaming machine. The method may be characterized as including the following steps 1) sending a high-level instruction for controlling the gaming peripheral from the master gaming controller (main control device) to a peripheral controller associated with the gaming controller via a standard peripheral connection, where the high-level instruction does not precisely specify how the gaming peripheral must perform an operation associated with the high-level instruction, 2)

Art Unit: 3713

converting the high-level instruction to one or more low-level operating instructions, at the peripheral controller (intermediate control device), for controlling the operation of one more peripheral devices provided with the gaming peripheral, 3) controlling operation of the one or more peripheral devices (lower control device) with the low-level operating instructions. One or more of the peripheral devices may be selected from the group consisting of lights, printers, coin hoppers, bill validators, ticket readers, card readers, key pads, button panels, display screens, speakers, information panels, motors, mass storage devices and solenoids. Stockdale teaches the transformation of a high level signal by an intermediate device into a low level signal for use by a low level device. Specifically columns 8, 16 and 17 disclose procedures where the master gaming controller sends instructions to a peripheral controller which then sends instructions to the peripheral. This is equivalent to a main control device for controlling a highest processing level which controls an intermediate control device on a second level which controls a lower control device on a third or lower level. As an example see column 16 where the master gaming controller sends a message to a light panel to strobe its lights which is interpreted by the peripheral controller and sent to the light panel. This can be seen in another way in figure 3 where the master gaming controller is the first level, the peripheral controller is the second level and the peripheral (324,322,320,etc) is the third level. With respect to claim 2 please see column 17 where a video display screen is associated with a peripheral controller. This means master gaming controller sends high level instructions to the peripheral controller which provides low level instruction to the video display screen to be processed. With

Art Unit: 3713

respect to claims 10-12 the control of the gaming machine is a one way process, the master gaming controller controls the peripheral controller which controls the peripheral. With respect to the bi-directional communication paragraphs 410, 412, and 413 of the instant application US Patent Application Publication 2001/0021666 state that such bi-directional communication of determining when a start or stop switch or the receipt of a command is well known within the art. The cited passage of pages 36 and 37 states that the command is passed only in one direction and Stockdale also passes the **command** in one direction. With respect to claim 11 see 2:62-63, 17:35-41. With respect to claims 13 and 14 see column 3 lines 5-10 where a plurality of standard communication ports for connect to the plurality of gaming peripherals is disclosed. Stockdale does not specifically state that there is one two and three levels of hierarchical processing, however Stockdale does teach the use of such processing scheme which would provide one of ordinary skill in the art the motivation to incorporate a well known hierarchical processing scheme which is advantageously taught by the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (MPCD) Third Edition. On page 451 the definition for structured programming states that; Programming that produces programs with clean flow, clear design, and a degree of modularity or hierarchical structure. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the processing of high level signals into low level signals is structured or "Hierarchical" programming as taught above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use hierarchical processing including mid level instructions as disclosed in Stockdale and specifically taught in the MPCD.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/23/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the applicant's representatives remarks regarding the differences in the wording of the rejection from McGlone to Stockdale the examiner has removed any reference to the previous McGlone reference. Stockdale stated most of what McGlone disclosed as noted above and the differences between the references that was removed by the examiner did not amount to any effect on the rejection.

With respect to the applicant's representatives remarks that claim 1 requires 3 CPU's this limitation cannot be found in the claim. With respect 3 separate CPU's in Stockdale see master gaming controller, peripheral controller and a peripheral specifically column 9 lines 63-65 which states each gaming peripheral with a peripheral controller contains an essentially identical control microprocessor.

With respect to the applicant's representatives remarks that the three hierarchical levels require distinct control boards please see the argument above.

With respect to the applicant's representatives definition A-D of what is well known in the art of computer programming go to further the examiners position that using a hierarchical level by breaking up the tasks and performing specific tasks within a peripheral controller or a peripheral is well known in the art.

With respect to the applicant's representatives arguments that the low level commands are not subject to further processing is not founded. The microprocessor in

the low level architecture takes these commands provided by the peripheral controller and executes the commands, which are processing the commands.

With respect to the applicant's representatives assertion that the transfer of signals from a high level through a intermediate device to a low level for use by a low level device is not hierarchical programming as claimed the applicant representative should check the provided definitions of hierarchical programming of which the above meets the definition.

With respect to the applicant's representative arguments with respect to claim 2 please see the rejection above.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

San et al '653, '230 and Koza et al '998 all disclose processing schemes.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3713

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M Hotaling II whose telephone number is 703 305 0780. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (703) 308 2064. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOHN M. HOTALING, II
PRIMARY EXAMINER

October 13, 2004

